

REMARKS

STATUS SUMMARY

Claims 1-39 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 9, 11-16, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0069 of *Forrester* (“*Forrester*”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,861,842 to *Tachita et al.* (“*Tachita*”), claims 1-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,519,403 to *Bickley et al.* (“*Bickley*”), claims 21-35 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,861,842 to *Hitch et al.* (“*Hitch*”), and claims 21-35 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,518,919 to *Durst et al.* (“*Durst*”). The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-19 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and claims 36-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. In response, Applicants have canceled claims 1-39 and added new claims 40-59.

These formal matters identified in the Office action are addressed herein below.

AMENDMENT TO SPECIFICATION

The title set forth at the top of page one of the specification has been amended to better identify the pending application. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

RESPONSE TO CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner has rejected claims 21-39 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because these claims are drawn to the identical subject matter as claimed in pending U. S. Patent Application 11/510,122

and U. S. Patent No. 6,738, 013. Claims 21-39 having been canceled, the rejections of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §101 are believed to now be moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – NON-STATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 6,747,596, claims 21-35 are rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6,738,013, claims 21-39 are rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of U.S. Patent No. 7,151,485, and claims 21-39 are provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of pending U. S. Patent Application No. 11/510,122.

Claims 1-39 having been canceled, the foregoing rejections of these claims under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting are believed to now be moot.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-39 having been canceled, the foregoing rejections of these claims 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 102(b) are believed to be moot.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 40-59 have been added. Claims 40-59 recite features believed to be fully supported by the application as originally filed, and accordingly no new matter is believed to

have been added. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, at page 5, paragraph [0020], and page 9, paragraph [0038], and elsewhere throughout the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry and allowance of newly-added claims 40-59.

CONCLUSION


In light of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in proper condition for allowance, and an early notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

If any small matter should remain outstanding after the Patent Examiner has had an opportunity to review the above Remarks, the Patent Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned patent attorney in order to resolve these matters and avoid the issuance of another Official Action.

Respectfully submitted,
Anthony James Orlor et al.

Dated: November 9, 2007

By:


Jeffrey C. Wilk
Registration No. 42,227
Phone: (818) 488-8148
Fax: (949) 608-3645

The Eclipse Group LLP
10605 Balboa Blvd., Suite 330
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Customer No. 34408